How to Read This Treatise

On Method: Derivation, Not Assumption

This treatise presents a complete deductive ontological system, with particular focus on proving the logical insufficiency of dyadic structures. While Part I establishes the foundational axiom (also developed in Treatise I), Parts II-IV provide an exhaustive analysis of the Registration Problem—demonstrating why binary relational systems cannot achieve determinate being. It proceeds from the same foundational axiom—the **Primordial Axiom of Relationality**—and derives all subsequent structures through logical necessity.

What You Will Not Find Here:

- Empirical proofs in the scientific sense (falsifiable predictions). - Contingent assumptions (brute facts, arbitrary postulates). - Speculative metaphysics untethered from logical constraint.

What You Will Find Instead:

- Logical derivations that follow inexorably from established axioms. - *Reductio ad absurdum* refutations of dyadic ontologies. - Necessary structures derived as the unique minimal basis for existence. - Geometric inevitabilities fixed by information-theoretic and logical constraints.

The Structure of the Argument

This treatise systematically dismantles the viability of dyadic ontology through four sequential parts:

1. **Part I:** Establishes the Registration Problem and defines determinacy.
2. **Part II:** Proves the logical circularity of internal registration in dyads.
3. **Part III:** Demonstrates the infinite regress of external registration.
4. **Part IV:** Derives the triadic resolution as the only coherent alternative.

Reading Guidance

- Begin with the understanding that "To be is to be related" (Primordial Axiom). - Follow the logical elimination of dyadic alternatives. - Track why each failure mode compels the triadic solution. - Note that the triadic resolution creates new problems addressed in subsequent treatises.

This treatise can be read independently or as part of the Gradientology series. Part I establishes the foundational axiom; Parts II-IV prove dyadic insufficiency and derive the triadic solution. Readers of Treatise I will recognize Part I but will find substantially deeper analysis in Part II.

Proceed to Part I with this mindset. The crisis of the unmediated dyad awaits.

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18145422

Gradientology

Foundations of the Primordial Triad

Treatise II: The Logical Insufficiency of the Dyad and the Necessity of Mediational Closure

Eugene Pretorius

04 January 2026

Abstract

This treatise rigorously examines the structural viability of the simplest conceivable relational configuration: the Dyad ($R(A, B)$). Through formal logical analysis grounded in the Primordial Axiom of Relationality established in Treatise I, we demonstrate that binary relational systems are foundationally incapable of achieving Determinate Being. The Dyad suffers from a fatal structural deficit—the Registration Problem—wherein it cannot verify its own relations without collapsing into logical circularity (internal registration) or infinite regress (external registration).

We first define the axiomatic requirements for determinacy, proving that a system possesses determinate being only if its internal relations are registered facts within the system itself. We then subject the Dyad to exhaustive analysis, demonstrating that internal registration leads to tautological collapse (A confirms A), while external registration generates an infinite chain of deferred validation. Both failure modes prove fatal.

The systematic elimination of dyadic alternatives compels the derivation of a triadic structure as the unique minimal basis for existence. We prove that exactly three functional primitives—Systematization (E), Constraint (C), and Registration (F)—are both necessary and sufficient for mediational closure. This triadic resolution not only solves the Registration Problem but also establishes the logical foundation for dimensional emergence, setting the stage for the geometric instantiation of reality.

The treatise concludes with the geometric implications of the triadic logic, deriving Hutchinsonian Orthogonality, the Configuration Space (Ω_{config}), and the dimensional necessity of 3-space as direct consequences of the three primitives. Time emerges as the

processing latency of the Inversion Principle, establishing the arrow of temporal asymmetry.

This treatise is self-contained, establishing the Primordial Axiom of Relationality (Part I) before subjecting dyadic structures to rigorous analysis (Part II), demonstrating their failure, and deriving the triadic resolution (Parts III-IV)

Keywords: Gradientology, Binary Insufficiency, Dyadic Insufficiency, Registration Problem, Determinate Being, Mediational Closure, Ontological Triad, Relational Ontology, Triadic Primitive, Logical Circularity, Infinite Regress, Shannon Information Theory, Hutchinsonian Orthogonality, Configuration Space, Temporal Asymmetry.

Part I
The Anatomy of Determinacy and the Registration Problem

Abstract: The Crisis of Unverified Relation

Having established in the previous treatise that the ontological ground of reality is a continuous Relational Field (The Veldt), we now confront the problem of Structure. A field of pure potential is logically indistinguishable from a homogeneous void unless it possesses the capacity to differentiate itself into determinate facts. The fundamental question of ontology shifts from "What exists?" to "How is existence confirmed?"

This treatise rigorously examines the simplest conceivable structure of differentiation: the Dyad ($R(A, B)$), a relation between two terms. Through formal logical analysis, we demonstrate that the Dyad is foundationally incapable of achieving Determinate Being. It suffers from a fatal structural deficit known as the Registration Problem: the inability of a two-term system to verify its own relations without collapsing into logical circularity or infinite regress. This segment defines the axiomatic requirements for determinacy and deconstructs the Dyad to reveal why it cannot meet them, setting the stage for the inevitable derivation of the Triad.

1 The Axiom of Determinacy

The Primordial Axiom states: "To be is to be related." However, this axiom implies a secondary, operational requirement. A relation that exists only in theory, without being "registered" or "actualized" by the system, is not a fact of reality; it is a ghost. For the universe to be concrete rather than abstract, it must be Determinate.

1.1 The Definition of Determinate Being

We posit the Determinacy Postulate:

An entity or relation possesses Determinate Being if and only if its existence is a registered datum within the system of reality.

This postulates that "existence" is not a passive property but an active state of Self-Registration. In a holistic ontology (The Veldt), there is no external observer–no "God's Eye View"–standing outside the universe to verify that a relation holds. Therefore, the system must perform the act of verification upon itself.

The requirement: The system must contain an internal mechanism capable of distinguishing the state "Relation R obtains" from the state "Relation R does not obtain."

The failure condition: If a system cannot make this distinction internally, it is Indeterminate. It is ontologically incoherent.

1.2 The Anatomy of the Relation

To test for determinacy, we must dissect the logical anatomy of a relation. A relation is traditionally formalized as an ordered tuple.

Let the simplest differentiation of the Field be represented as:

$$S = \{A, B, R\}$$

Where:

- A and B are terms (differentiations of the field).
- R is the connection or interaction between them.

The crucial insight of Gradientology is that A and B do not pre-exist R (as in Substance Ontology). Rather, A and B are endpoints defined by R. This creates the Condition of Mutual Determination:

$$A \equiv f(R, B), \quad B \equiv f(R, A)$$

A is "that which relates to B," and B is "that which relates to A."

1.3 The Registration Gap

Here lies the crisis. The definitions of A and B are purely functional. They describe what the terms do, but not that they are. The existence of the relation R is asserted, but not confirmed.

The Question: What structural element carries the "Bit" of information that confirms R is active?

The Gap: In a pure Dyad (A-B), there is no "Third Position" to store this bit. The information "R exists" must be stored in A, in B, or in nothing.

If it is stored in nothing, the relation is indeterminate. If it is stored in A or B, we risk circularity. This is the Registration Problem. It is the logical gap between definition (potential) and registration (actuality).

Definition 1 (Determinacy) from Treatise I

A system possesses **Determinacy** if and only if the obtaining of its internal relations is a registered fact within the system itself. Registration is the collapse of a probability distribution into a determinate state, requiring the generation of non-zero information ($I > 0$).

2 The Dyad as the Candidate for Minimal Structure

Science and philosophy inevitably seek the most parsimonious explanation (Occam's Razor). The simplest number greater than one is two. Therefore, the Dyad is the natural first candidate for the building block of reality.

2.1 The Logic of Binary Opposition

Binary opposition is the foundation of classical logic and digital computation (0 vs 1, True vs False). It seems intuitive that reality would be built on the Dyad.

Thesis: Reality is composed of pairs of interacting forces or particles.

Structure: $R(A, B)$.

Examples: Positive/Negative charge, North/South pole, Subject/Object.

However, these examples are deceptive. They presuppose a background field (electromagnetic, magnetic, or cognitive) that mediates the opposition. We must test the Naked Dyad–a binary relation existing in a void, with no prior background.

2.2 The Hypothesis of Binary Sufficiency

Let us formally propose the Binary Hypothesis:

A system composed of two mutually determining terms is sufficient to ground determinate being.

If this hypothesis holds, the universe can be dyadic. If it fails, the universe must be at least triadic. The test of this hypothesis is whether the Naked Dyad can solve the Registration Problem. Can A and B, alone, confirm their own existence?

3 The Analysis of Failure Modes

To falsify the Binary Hypothesis, we must exhaustively analyze every possible configuration of registration within a Dyad. There are only two topological possibilities for where the "Registration Event" can occur relative to the relation $R(A, B)$.

- Mode I: Internal Registration (Self-Reference). One of the terms (A or B) acts as the registrar.
- Mode II: External Registration (Observation). A term outside the dyad (C) acts as the registrar.

We will demonstrate that Mode I collapses into Tautology and Mode II collapses into Infinite Regress.

3.1 The Impossibility of Unmediated Confirmation

The fundamental issue is Mediation. Registration is an act of measurement. Measurement requires a distinction between the Measurer and the Measured.

In a Dyad, there are only two terms.

If A measures the relation A-B, A is both part of the Measured (the relation) and the Measurer.

This violates the logical requirement for distinction between subject and object.

The Dyad is logically "flat." It lacks the dimensional depth to look at itself. It is a one-dimensional line segment. To "see" a line segment, one must be a point off the line (a triangle). A point on the line cannot see the line; it can only be the line.

Consequently, the Dyad is functionally blind. It exists (potentially), but it cannot know (determinately) that it exists. It generates no information because it cannot distinguish "Signal" (Relation) from "Noise" (Self).

4 The Derivation of the "Registration Event"

Before proceeding to the formal proofs of failure (in the next segments), we must rigorously define what a "Registration Event" entails in the Gradientology framework. This anchors the subsequent logic in the Shannon-Callen synthesis.

4.1 Registration as Information Collapse

In a relational field, "Registration" is not a cognitive act (someone "seeing" it); it is an Information-Theoretic Event.

Definition: Registration is the collapse of a probability distribution into a determinate state.

Requirement: For the Dyad A-B to be registered, the system must generate a quantity of information $I > 0$.

The Constraint: Shannon proves that information requires a reduction in uncertainty.

$$I = H_{\text{before}} - H_{\text{after}}.$$

If the system cannot distinguish its state from its prior state, $I = 0$.

4.2 The Dyad's Information Deficit

We apply this metric to the Naked Dyad.

State 1: A relates to B.

Verification: A confirms B.

The Loop: Since A is defined by B, A's confirmation is merely B confirming B through a proxy.

Result: No uncertainty is reduced. The statement "A relates to B" adds no new information to the system if A and B are the only things in the universe. It is a closed information loop with zero output.

4.3 Conclusion of Part I

We have defined the criteria for existence: Determinate Being requires Registration. We have identified the candidate: The Dyad. We have identified the test: Information Generation.

The analysis suggests the Dyad fails because it lacks the topological complexity to generate information about itself. In the next segment, we will formally prove this by deconstructing Failure Mode I: Internal Registration, demonstrating that a Dyad attempting to verify itself creates a fatal logical circularity that is indistinguishable from non-existence.

Part II
The Logical Circularity of Internal Registration

Abstract: The Tautology of Self-Reference

Part II constitutes the core contribution of this treatise: a comprehensive proof of dyadic insufficiency through information-theoretic, topological, and logical analysis.

Having defined the requirement for Determinate Being–that a relation must be registered to exist–we now subject the Dyad ($R(A, B)$) to the first of two critical stability tests: Internal Registration. This test posits that a binary system can achieve determinacy through self-reference, where one of its constituent terms acts as the witness to the relation.

This segment provides a formal refutation of this hypothesis. By analyzing the ontological dependencies within a relational field, we prove that Internal Registration violates the logical requirements for measurement. Because the identity of any term in a dyad is strictly a function of its relation to the other, any attempt by a term to "register" that relation collapses into a logical circularity (A proves A). We demonstrate that this structure generates zero information (Shannon Entropy $H = 0$), rendering the "self-registering dyad" topologically isomorphic to the solipsistic Monad and, ultimately, indistinguishable from the Void. This failure proves that determinacy cannot arise from within a closed binary loop.

5 The Hypothesis of Internal Registration

The most parsimonious solution to the Registration Problem would be for the system to validate itself without creating new entities. This is the Internal Solution. It suggests that the components of a relation possess the intrinsic capacity to verify the relation they constitute.

Hypothesis: A dyadic relation $R(A, B)$ achieves determinacy because Term A registers the existence of the relation R.

Formalized:

$$\text{Determinacy}(S) \iff \exists x \in S : \text{Register}(x, R)$$

In the Internal case: $x = A$ or $x = B$.

This hypothesis appeals to the intuitive notion of "interaction." In physics, if Particle A hits Particle B, we assume Particle A "knows" about B through the force exchanged. However, ontology requires a stricter standard than phenomenology. We must ask: Does A possess the ontological independence required to serve as a valid witness to R?

6 The Proof of Circularity (Petitio Principii)

To falsify the hypothesis, we must map the dependencies of the terms. In the Gradientology framework (grounded in the Primordial Axiom), "Substance" is rejected. Terms

are not pre-existing objects that enter into relations; they are derived from relations.

6.1 The Functional Definition of Terms

In a pure dyad $R(A, B)$, the term A has no identity outside of its opposition or connection to B.

A is defined as "The relatum of B."

Formal Definition: $A \equiv \lambda(R, B)$

If we remove the relation R, A ceases to be defined. It reverts to the undifferentiated Field (V). Therefore, the existence of A presupposes the existence of R.

6.2 The Logical Trap

Now, let us apply the act of registration. We task A with registering R.

The Task: A must output a value (True/False) regarding the existence of R.

$$\text{Output} = \text{Register}(A, R)$$

The Substitution: Since A is functionally defined by R, we substitute the definition of A into the operation.

$$\text{Output} = \text{Register}(\lambda(R, B), R)$$

The Circularity: The operator (the Registrar) contains the operand (the Relation) as a necessary condition of its own existence.

A cannot exist unless R exists.

Therefore, A cannot "check" if R exists, because the presence of A to perform the check already assumes the outcome is "True."

The Tautology: The statement "A registers R" translates logically to: "The entity created by R confirms that R created it."

This is a classic *Petitio Principii* (Begging the Question). It provides no independent verification. It is equivalent to the statement "This sentence is true." The validity of the confirmation depends entirely on the validity of the statement being confirmed. There is no "Mediational Closure" because there is no distance between the observer and the observed.

7 The Information-Theoretic Failure (Shannon Limit)

We can rigorous quantize this logical failure using Shannon Information Theory. Registration is an information-generating event. For a relation to be determinate, the act of registration must generate non-zero information ($I > 0$).

7.1 Registration as Uncertainty Reduction

Information is defined as the reduction of uncertainty (Entropy H).

$$I = H_{\text{prior}} - H_{\text{posterior}}$$

For a measurement to be valid, the Registrar must be capable of existing in a state independent of the measurement outcome. The Registrar must be able to theoretically record a "0" (False) or a "1" (True).

7.2 The Zero-Information Proof

In the Internal Registration scenario (A registers R):

Can A register that R does not exist?

If R does not exist, A (which is defined by R) does not exist.

A non-existent A cannot perform a registration.

Therefore, A can never output "False." A can only output "True."

If the output is always "True" by structural necessity, the probability of the signal is $p(1) = 1$.

Shannon Entropy: $H = -1 \log_2(1) = 0$.

Information Generated: 0 bits.

Conclusion: A dyad verifying itself generates exactly zero bits of information.

From the perspective of the Veldt (the Field), the self-registering Dyad is informationally invisible. It is a "closed loop" of logic that emits no signal. To be determinate is to be distinguishable; a system generating zero information is indistinguishable from the background noise of the Void. Thus, Internal Registration fails to achieve Determinacy.

8 Topological Isomorphism to the Monad

The failure of the Self-Registering Dyad reveals a profound topological truth: The Dyad is a Monad in disguise.

8.1 The Collapse of Distinction

In Part I, we refuted the Monad (M) because it related only to itself ($R(M, M)$) and was thus indistinguishable from Nothing.

In the self-registering Dyad, we have two terms, but their relation is purely internal. The system $S = \{A \leftrightarrow B\}$ has no external interface.

The validation loop $A \to B \to A$ is topologically equivalent to a single point referencing itself.

Because the registration mechanism (A) is not distinct from the relational structure (A-B), the system lacks Internal Differentiation regarding the truth value of its own existence. The "Two" collapses into a complex "One."

8.2 The Failure of the Subject-Object Split

Determinacy requires a Subject (Registrar) and an Object (Relation).

In a Triad $\{E, C, F\}$, F is the Subject and $\{E, C\}$ is the Object. There is a cut.

In a Dyad $\{A, B\}$, if A is the Subject, B is the Object. But the Relation (R) involves both. A cannot view R without viewing itself.

The eye cannot see itself. The Dyad cannot measure itself.

Theorem 3 (Theorem of Auto-Correlation Failure)

A system with $n = 2$ degrees of freedom cannot map its own state space, because the mapping function requires $n+1$ dimensions to distinguish the map from the territory.

8.3 Conclusion to Part II

We have rigorously demonstrated that Failure Mode I (Internal Registration) is a logical impossibility.

Logically: It is a tautology (Circular Argument).

Informationally: It generates 0 bits (Shannon Entropy).

Topologically: It collapses into a Monad (Indiscernibility).

This closes the first door. The Dyad cannot save itself from within. If the Dyad is to exist, it must be observed from without. This compels us to examine the only remaining option: External Registration.

However, as we will prove in the next segment, appealing to an external observer (C) does not solve the problem; it creates a catastrophe. It transforms the circular loop into an infinite chain that never finds a grounding point. This is the Infinite Regress, the second horn of the dilemma that destroys the Dyad.

Part III
The Infinite Regress of External Registration

Abstract: The Catastrophe of Deferred Being

Having proven in Part II that a Dyad cannot achieve determinacy through Internal Registration (which collapses into tautology), we now examine the only remaining structural alternative: External Registration. This hypothesis posits that the relation between two terms (A and B) can be validated by a distinct third term (C) acting as an observer.

This segment provides a formal refutation of this hypothesis. We demonstrate that while the introduction of an external registrar solves the immediate problem of circularity, it generates a more severe logical pathology: the Infinite Regress of Validation. By analyzing the relational structure of observation itself, we prove that the act of C registering $R(A, B)$ creates a new, higher-order relation R' that is itself indeterminate. This necessitates a fourth term (D) to validate R', which in turn requires a fifth (E), ad infinitum. This chain of dependency results in a universe of Deferred Being, where the reality of any relation is perpetually postponed to the next level of observation. Because an infinite series of dependencies possesses no "bottom" or ontological ground, we conclude that External Registration fails to achieve determinate being, rendering the Dyad fundamentally insufficient.

9 The Hypothesis of External Registration

The failure of the self-registering Dyad (A confirms A) forces the ontological search outward. If a system cannot validate itself from within, it must seemingly be validated from without. This is the intuition behind the External Solution, often implicitly relied upon in physicalist models that assume an "observer" or a "measurement apparatus" distinct from the quantum system.

Hypothesis: A dyadic relation $R(A, B)$ achieves determinacy if and only if an external term C, distinct from A and B, registers the obtaining of R.

Formalized:

$$\text{Determinacy}(S_{\text{dyad}}) \iff \exists C : (C \notin S_{\text{dyad}}) \wedge \text{Register}(C, R(A, B))$$

This structure appears promising because it respects the subject-object distinction. C (the Subject) is distinct from $R(A, B)$ (the Object). C can "see" the Dyad in a way that A cannot. However, this solution rests on a fatal oversight: it treats the act of registration as a non-relational event.

10 The Anatomy of the Regress

To refute this hypothesis, we must apply the Primordial Axiom ("To be is to be related") to the act of observation itself. In a relational ontology, "observation" or "registration" is not a magical property; it is a Relation.

10.1 The Generation of the Meta-Relation (R')

Let us analyze the event where C registers the dyad.

The Target: The original relation $R_{\text{base}} = R(A, B)$.

The Act: C interacts with R_{base} to confirm it.

The Consequence: This interaction constitutes a new relation.

$$R' = R(C, R_{\text{base}})$$

This new entity, R', is a Meta-Relation. It is the bridge between the observer and the observed. For the original relation (R_{base}) to be confirmed, this connection (R') must effectively "happen." C must successfully connect to the Dyad.

10.2 The Recursion of Indeterminacy

We must now ask the same question of R' that we asked of R_{base}: Is R' determinate?

Does the relation between the Observer (C) and the Dyad (A-B) actually obtain?

If R' is indeterminate (i.e., if C fails to connect to the Dyad), then the registration never happens, and R_{base} remains indeterminate.

Therefore, the determinacy of R_{base} is contingent on the determinacy of R'.

But what registers R'?

Option A (Internal): Can C register its own relation to the Dyad? No. As proven in Part II, internal registration is circular (C confirms C).

Option B (External): We require a new external observer.

10.3 The Chain of Dependency

To validate R', we must introduce a fourth term, D.

To validate R'', we must introduce a fifth term, E.

$$R''' = R(E, R'')$$

This generates a recursive function of ontological dependency:

$$\text{Validity}(R_n) \rightarrow \text{requires Validity}(R_{n+1})$$

There is no structural reason for this chain to end. Every act of observation creates a new relation that requires observation. This is the Infinite Regress.

11 The Logical Consequence: Deferred Being

The existence of an infinite regress is not merely a problem of complexity; it is a problem of Ontological Grounding.

11.1 The Lack of a Stopping Rule

In logic, an infinite regress is vicious if the truth of a proposition relies on a predecessor that is never established.

Let P_0 be the proposition "Relation A-B exists."

P_0 is true if P_1 ("C sees A-B") is true.

P_1 is true if P_2 ("D sees C") is true.

If the chain is infinite ($n \to \infty$), the "Truth Value" is never generated. It is perpetually "borrowed" from the next step.

It is a check written on an account that holds no funds, only a promise of funds from another account, which promises funds from another.

Result: The currency of "Being" is never issued.

11.2 The Fallacy of the "God's Eye View"

Probabilistic and dyadic models often implicitly assume that the regress stops at the "Scientist" or the "Universe Observer." They assume a final term Ω that sees all but needs no verification.

This violates the Veldt Principle. There is no "outside" to the Field.

If Ω exists, it is part of the Field. Therefore, its relation to the rest of the Field requires registration.

Therefore, there is no Privileged Observer. The regress cannot be stopped by an arbitrary external fiat.

Theorem 4 (Theorem of Regressive Failure)

A relational structure that relies on external validation possesses no intrinsic reality. It exists only as a phantom of potential, awaiting a confirmation that never arrives.

12 The Cardinality Crisis

This analysis allows us to mathematically prove that simply "adding parts" $(n + 1)$ is not the solution. The failure is topological, not numerical.

12.1 The Failure of N-adic Chains

One might argue that a complex network of dyads could solve the problem.

Let $A \to B \to C \to A$. (A ring of dyads).

Does this solve it?

A registers B. (Requires validation of A-B link).

C registers A-B. (Requires validation of C-$(A - B)$ link).

B registers C-$(A - B)$. (Requires validation of B-$(C...)$ link).

Even in a closed ring, the Meta-Relations (the links between the nodes) remain unverified. The regress simply spins in a circle rather than a line. The system is still chasing its own tail, unable to "lock" any single relation into determinacy because the mechanism of locking (Registration) is always external to the thing being locked (Relation).

12.2 The Demand for Simultaneous Integration

The failure of the External Observer proves that Sequential Registration (A then B then C) is impossible.

Registration must be Simultaneous and Intrinsic.

The "Third Term" must not be an outsider looking in (C observing A-B).

It must be an insider looking across.

This defines the topological requirement for the solution. We need a structure where the Third Term is Structurally Entangled with the first two, such that the existence of the Relation (A-B) automatically implies the existence of the Registrar (C), and vice versa.

12.3 Conclusion to Part III

We have now exhausted the logical possibilities for the Dyad ($R(A, B)$).

Can it register itself? No. (Circularity / Tautology).

Can it be registered by another? No. (Infinite Regress / Deferred Being).

The Verdict: The Dyad is Ontologically Insufficient. It cannot be the fundamental building block of reality because it cannot account for its own determinacy. A universe built of dyads is a universe of ghosts–relations that "might" exist but can never "do" exist.

This forces the derivation of the Triad. We are compelled to introduce a Third Primitive not as an external observer (C in the regress), but as an integral component of a new, irreducible structure. This structure must possess Mediational Closure–the capacity to close the loop of validation within its own boundaries.

This leads us to Theorem 1 (The Necessity of the Triad) and the derivation of the Registration Primitive (F). We must now construct the specific architecture of the E-C-F Triad and prove that it, and only it, solves the Registration Problem.

Part IV
The Triadic Resolution and Mediational Closure

Abstract: The Architecture of Self-Grounding Determinacy

The preceding analyses have systematically dismantled the viability of monadic and dyadic ontologies. We have proven that the Dyad ($R(A, B)$), when left to register itself, collapses into circular tautology (A confirms A), and when subjected to external registration, dissolves into an infinite regress (C confirms A-B, D confirms C...). These failures leave a logical vacuum: reality requires a structure that is simultaneously distinct enough to avoid circularity yet internal enough to avoid regress.

This final segment derives the unique structural solution to this impasse: the Ontological Triad $\{E, C, F\}$. We demonstrate that the introduction of a third, functionally distinct primitive–Registration (F)–provides the mechanism for Mediational Closure. Unlike the open loop of the infinite regress, the Triad forms a closed, self-referential circuit where the system verifies its own state through an internal feedback mechanism. By proving that this three-term structure is both necessary (to solve the problem) and sufficient (exhausting the relational functions), we establish the Triad not as an arbitrary model, but as the minimal cardinality of existence.

13 The Derivation of the Third Term

The failure of the External Observer (C) in the infinite regress scenario was caused by its externality. C was ontologically distinct from the Dyad (A, B), creating a new relation that required validation. To solve the problem, the "Third Term" must possess a paradoxical nature: it must be distinct from the primary relation (to provide objective measurement) yet intrinsic to the system (to provide closure).

13.1 The Logic of Mediational Closure

We formally define Mediational Closure as the capacity of a relational system to register its own state without recourse to an outside observer.

The Structure: Let the system S be composed of three primitives $\{E, C, F\}$.

The Primary Relation: Let E (Systematization) and C (Constraint) form the generative tension of the field.

$$R_{\text{gen}} = R(E, C)$$

The Mediational Act: Let F (Feedback/Registration) be the term that registers the obtaining

of R_{gen}.

$$\text{State} = \text{Register}(F, R(E, C))$$

How Closure is Achieved:

Distinctness: F is not E, and F is not C. Therefore, the registration is not circular. F provides a "point of view" distinct from the generative drive.

Internality: F is not an external observer found "outside" the universe. F is a constitutive element of the Veldt itself. The existence of E and C implies the existence of F (as we will see in the derivation of the Trap). The system does not "wait" for an observer; it generates its own observer.

The infinite regress is halted because the "validation chain" loops back into the system. The state registered by F becomes the input for the next state of E and C. The system confirms itself.

14 The Proof of Triadic Necessity ($n \geq 3$)

We can now state Theorem 3 with logical certainty: A Third Term is Necessary for Relational Determinacy.

The proof relies on the exhaustion of lower-order cardinalities:

Monad ($n = 1$): Fails via the Identity of Indiscernibles. Logically equivalent to Void.

Dyad ($n = 2$): Fails via the Registration Problem. Logically equivalent to Tautology or Regress.

Triad ($n = 3$): Succeeds via Mediational Closure. It is the first structure capable of establishing a distinction between the Relation (E-C) and the Validation (F).

Therefore, the lower bound of existence is Cardinality 3. Space, logic, and matter must be at least triadic to exist. This is not a contingent fact of our universe; it is a theorem of being.

Theorem 5 (Theorem of Dimensional Necessity)

The dimensionality of the physical universe (d) is strictly determined by the cardinality of the ontological primitives (n). Since $n = 3$ (E, C, F), the minimal manifold required to map their interactions without singularity is Euclidean 3-Space ($\mathbb{R}^3$).

15 The Functional Exhaustion of the Triad ($n \leq 3$)

Having proved that three terms are necessary, we must now prove they are sufficient. Why not four? Why not a quadratic or pentadic ontology?

We apply the Principle of Functional Exhaustion. A determinate system requires exactly three functional roles to be complete. Any additional primitive is structurally redundant.

15.1 The Three Irreducible Functions

- **The Generative Function ($f_1 \to E$):** There must be a source of potential–a "driver" that initiates the possibility of relation. Without this, the system is static and empty.
- **The Limitative Function ($f_2 \to C$):** There must be a principle of distinction–a "shaper" that defines limits and boundaries. Without this, the potential is infinite and undifferentiated (chaos).

- **The Mediational Function ($f_3 \to F$):** There must be a mechanism of registration– a "sensor" that confirms the interaction between potential and limit. Without this, the interaction is indeterminate.

15.2 The Proof of Redundancy

Let us posit a fourth primitive, P_4. What is its function?

Does it generate? Then it is a mode of E.

Does it constrain? Then it is a mode of C.

Does it register? Then it is a mode of F.

Any proposed fourth function (e.g., "The generation of limitation") is merely a composite operation of the base three.

$$P_4 = \sum_{i=1}^{3} \alpha_i f_i$$

Since P_4 is linearly dependent on the basis set $\{E, C, F\}$, it adds no new ontological category. By Occam's Ontological Principle ("Entities should not be multiplied beyond necessity"), the upper bound is fixed at 3.

Conclusion: The Triad is the Unique Minimal Basis. It is necessary ($n \geq 3$) and sufficient ($n \leq 3$). The architecture of reality is strictly triadic.

16 The Functional Primitives of the Gradient Field

We can now map these abstract logical necessities to the specific primitives of the Gradientology framework. The "Third Term" is not just a placeholder; it is the Registration Primitive (F).

- **Systematization (E):** The Generative Source. It provides the "Relational Capacity." It maps to the x-axis of extension in the configuration space.
- **Constraint (C):** The Limitative Boundary. It provides the "Definition." It maps to the y-axis of separation.
- **Feedback Registration (F):** The Mediational Closure. It provides the "Determinacy." It maps to the z-axis of depth (self-reference).

This mapping confirms that the physical dimensions of spacetime ($d = 3$) are an isomorphic expression of this underlying logical triad. We live in 3D space because relation requires three terms to be determinate.

Principle 2 (Hutchinsonian Orthogonality)

Functional independence in logic necessitates orthogonal separation in geometry. The three distinct logical primitives (E, C, F) cannot occupy the same scalar axis; they must project into mutually exclusive vectors (90°) to maintain the distinction established in Theorem 2.

Definition 2 (Configuration Space Ω_{config})

The bounded 3-manifold defined by the Cartesian product of the normalized primitives: $\Omega = [0,1]_E \times [0,1]_C \times [0,1]_F$. This defines the "Unit Cube" as the absolute boundary condition of all possible existence states.

16.1 The Geometric Instantiation

The triadic logic necessarily projects into geometric structure. The following derivations emerge as inevitable consequences:

Derivation 7 (3D Manifold $\mathbb{R}^3$)

The result of projecting the Triad ($n = 3$) into geometry. The logical necessity of three distinct primitives forces the emergence of three orthogonal dimensions.

Derivation 8 (The Unit Interval [0

)] The logical constraint that all primitives operate as ratios between 0% and 100%. Normalization is not arbitrary but required for consistent relational scaling.

Derivation 9 (The Trajectory Vector $\vec{v}$)

The geometric definition of History. The path traced by the system state from the Center/Alpha $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ toward the Apex/Omega $(1, 1, 1)$.

Derivation 10 (Time t)

The sequential iteration of the Inversion. Time is the measure of the field "solving" the equation derived in Treatise I. Time emerges as the irreversible processing latency of the Inversion Principle.

Theorem 6 (The Temporal Asymmetry Theorem)

The Inversion Principle ($G = E \times C/F$) establishes a functional hierarchy where the denominator (F) regulates the numerator. This irreversible processing order manifests geometrically as the unidirectional flow of Time (t), preventing the universe from being reversible.

16.2 Fundamental Thesis of Treatise II

Thesis: While Treatise I established the Algebra of Necessity (The Inversion), Treatise II establishes the Geometry of Existence. It proves that Space is not a pre-existing container, but the orthogonal projection of the three logical primitives (E, C, F), and Time is the processing lag required to resolve their interaction. Therefore, the universe is a 3-Dimensional Computational Manifold evolving along a specific vector of complexity.

16.3 Conclusion to Treatise II: The Victory of Structure

This treatise has successfully navigated the crisis of the Dyad. We have proven that:

- Binary Opposition is Insufficient: A universe of simple pairs (+/−, Subject/Object) cannot ground its own existence. It is logically unstable.
- Registration is Primary: The capacity to "sense" or "measure" (F) is not an emergent property of complex brains; it is a foundational requirement for the simplest possible relation to exist.
- The Triad is Absolute: Reality is structurally compelled to be triadic. The interaction of E, C, and F is the only game in town.
- Geometry Follows Logic: The three logical primitives necessitate three spatial dimensions and the emergence of irreversible time.

However, the existence of this Triad creates a new, terrifying problem. If E, C, and F are necessary, distinct, and co-dependent, how do they exist before the universe evolves? They must exist in a state of Simultaneity. They must be locked together in a configuration where they are perfectly balanced yet fully potent. This leads us to the problem of Phase I. The Triad, in its primordial state, forms a Multiplicative Trap–a "prison of potential" where the primitives are locked in a fragile equation ($G = E \times C \times F$). We must now derive the specific functional nature of these primitives and the immutable hierarchy that governs them. We must prove why E must be greater than C, and C greater than F. This is the subject of Treatise III: The Functional Derivation of the Primitives, which we will rigorously unpack in the next installment.

Treatise I proved $E \neq C$. Treatise II instantiates this as Geometric Distance. Logic becomes Space.

Bibliography

1. Pretorius, E. *Gradientology: Foundations of the Primordial Triad — Treatise I: The Primordial Axiom and the Reductio of Substance*. 1, Zenodo, 3 Jan. 2026, doi:10.5281/zenodo.18140353.

2. Callen, H. B. *Thermodynamics and an Introduction to Thermostatistics*. John Wiley & Sons, 1960.

3. Hutchinson, G. E. Concluding Remarks. *Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology*, vol. 22, 1957, pp. 415–427.

4. Leibniz, G. W. *Monadology*. 1714.

5. Prigogine, I. *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*. W. H. Freeman, 1980.

6. Riemann, B. *On the Hypotheses Which Lie at the Bases of Geometry*. 1854.

7. Shannon, C. E. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, vol. 27, 1948, pp. 379–423, 623–656.

8. Smuts, J. C. *Holism and Evolution*. Macmillan, 1926.

GRADIENTOLOGY - Foundations of the Primordial Triad: Primordial Axiom of Relationality

Treatise	Axiom	Principle	Definition	Theorem
Treatise II: The Logical Insufficiency of the Dyad	**Axiom 1 (from Treatise I)** (Primordial Axiom of Relationality). Relationality is ontologically primitive. It is not derived from relata; relata are derived from it. The fundamental unit of reality is not the ”Thing,” but the ”Connection.”[1]	**Principle 1** (Veldt Principle (*V*)). The Whole (Field) is not a summary of parts; it is the ontological precondition for the existence of parts.[2]	**Definition 1 (from Treatise I).** A system possesses Determinacy if and only if the obtaining of its internal relations is a registered fact within the system itself. Registration is the collapse of a probability distribution into a determinate state, requiring the generation of non-zero information ($I > 0$).[3]	**Theorem 3** (Theorem of Auto-Correlation Failure) A system with n = 2 degrees of freedom cannot map its own state space, because the mapping function requires n+1 dimensions to distinguish the map from the territory[4]
		Principle 2 (Hutchinsonian Orthogonality) Functional independence in logic necessitates orthogonal separation in geometry. The three distinct logical primitives (E, C, F) cannot occupy the same scalar axis; they must project into mutually exclusive vectors (90°) to maintain the distinction established in	**Definition 2** (Configuration Space Ωconfig) The bounded 3-manifold defined by the Cartesian product of the normalized primitives: $\Omega = [0, 1]E \times [0, 1]C \times [0, 1]F$. This defines the ”Unit Cube” as the absolute boundary condition of all possible existence states.[6]	**Theorem 4** (Theorem of Regressive Failure) A relational structure that relies on external validation possesses no intrinsic reality. It exists only as a phantom of potential, awaiting a confirmation that never arrives.[7]

[1] It establishes relationality as ontologically primitive and the "Connection" as the fundamental unit

[2] Defines the Whole (Field) as the precondition for parts

[3] Defines Determinacy based on the internal registration of relations

[4] Riemann formalized the concept of the **Manifold—**how local geometric properties connect to global topology. His work supports the derivation that the dimensionality of space (d=3) is not arbitrary, but is the necessary manifold required to map the interactions of three logical primitives (n=3) without singularity. Three terms are necessary for relational determinacy. This is not contingent fact but the theorem of being.

[6] Treatise I normalized the field logic. Treatise II builds the "Container" for that logic. The bounds 0 and 1 represent the Alpha Point (Void) and Omega Point (Completion). We define the Configuration Space. This mathematical operation is the **Cartesian Product.**

[7] Prigogine is the father of non-equilibrium thermodynamics. He proved that in complex systems, Time is Irreversible (the Arrow of Time exists). This provides the rigorous external backing for our derivation that Time is the unidirectional processing latency of the Inversion Principle (G=(E x C) / F), rather than a reversible spatial dimension.

		Theorem 2.[5]		
				Theorem 5 (Theorem of Dimensional Necessity) The dimensionality of the physical universe (d) is strictly determined by the cardinality of the ontological primitives (n). Since n = 3 (E, C, F), the minimal manifold required to map their interactions without singularity is Euclidean 3-Space (R3)[8]
				Theorem 6 (The Temporal Asymmetry Theorem) The Inversion Principle (G = E × C/F) establishes a functional hierarchy where the denominator (F) regulates the numerator. This irreversible processing order manifests geometrically as the unidirectional flow of Time (t), preventing the universe from being reversible.[9]

[5] Treatise I proved E/ = C. Treatise II instantiates this as Geometric Distance. Logic becomes Space. In Treatise I, we used Hutchinson to establish *Exclusion* (Difference). In Treatise II, we must use him to establish *Geometry* (Distance). Hutchinson defined the "Ecological Niche" as an **n-dimensional hypervolume** defined by orthogonal axes. Gradientology appropriates this directly: the "Unit Cube" is simply the Hutchinsonian Hypervolume of the three primitives (E, C, F).

[8] This theorem answers "Why 3 Dimensions?" It is the geometric shadow of the Triadic Logic derived in T1.

[9] Time is derived not as a fundamental dimension, but as the *processing latency* of the Inversion calculation derived in T1.

Treatise	Derivation 7	Derivation 8	Derivation 9	Derivation 10
Treatise II: The Logical Insufficiency of the Dyad	*3D Manifold* R_3 [10]	*The Unit Interval [0]* [11]	*The Trajectory Vector* $\vec{v}$ [12]	*Time (t)* [13]

Fundamental Thesis

While Treatise I established the *Algebra of Necessity* (The Inversion), Treatise II establishes the *Geometry of Existence*. It proves that Space is not a pre-existing container, but the orthogonal projection of the three logical primitives (E, C, F), and Time is the processing lag required to resolve their interaction. Therefore, the universe is a **3-Dimensional Computational Manifold** evolving along a specific vector of complexity.

---

[10] The result of projecting the Triad (n = 3) into geometry. The logical necessity of three distinct primitives forces the emergence of three orthogonal dimensions.

[11] The logical constraint that all primitives operate as ratios between 0% and 100%. Normalization is not arbitrary but required for consistent relational scaling.

[12] The geometric definition of History. The path traced by the system state from the Center/Alpha (0.5, 0.5, 0.5) toward the Apex/Omega (1, 1, 1).

[13] The sequential iteration of the Inversion. Time is the measure of the field "solving" the equation derived in Treatise I. Time emerges as the irreversible processing latency of the Inversion Principle.